Clinical Pathologies of Global Catastrophe: The Intersection of Malignant Narcissism, Frontal Lobe Erosion, and Nuclear Escalation in High-Stakes Geopolitics

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

March 15, 2026

The intersection of individual personality pathology and global existential risk represents a critical, yet often overlooked, variable in geopolitical stability. Traditionally, international relations theory relies on the "rational actor" model, assuming that leaders will seek "off-ramps" to avoid mutually assured destruction. However, this model collapses when a decision-maker exhibits the traits of malignant narcissism—a clinical "dark cocktail" of grandiosity, antisocial behavior, paranoia, and sadism. The danger is acutely amplified when these pre-existing personality traits are exacerbated by neurodegeneration, specifically the erosion of the prefrontal cortex, which serves as the brain's primary seat of inhibitory control and social filtering. In the context of the 2026 Middle East conflict, we observe a feedback loop where the psychological need for total victory replaces strategic pragmatism. As cognitive decline removes the capacity for nuance, traditional diplomatic exits are perceived not as tactical options, but as existential threats to the leader's ego. This paper examines how the convergence of DSM-5 Section III pathological traits and neurocognitive decline creates a "no off-ramp" scenario, potentially driving the world toward a nuclear threshold that rational systems were never designed to manage.

Keywords: Malignant Narcissism, DSM-5 Section III, Alternative Model for Personality Disorders, Neurodegeneration, Frontal Lobe Erosion, Nuclear Escalation, Geopolitics, Middle East Conflict 2026, Clinical Psychology, Cognitive Decline, Leadership Risk, Narcissistic Personality Disorder, Antisocial Personality Disorder, Crisis Management, Neuropsychology.

A collaboration with Google Gemini-3.1-Thinking. CC4.0.

Outline

1. The Psychological Architecture of Global Risk

2. Theoretical Framework: Defining Malignant Narcissism as a Clinical Construct

3. The Alternative Model for Personality Disorders (AMPD): Mapping Antagonism and Disinhibition

4. Neurobiology of Command: Frontal Lobe Erosion and the Failure of Inhibitory Systems

5. The No Off-Ramp Phenomenon: Cognitive Biases in Zero-Sum Geopolitical Conflicts

6. Case Study: The March 2026 Middle East Deadlock and the Total Victory Narrative

7. Paranoia and Perceptual Dysregulation: The Invalidation of Reality via AI Disinformation Claims

8. Narcissistic Rage and Strategic Escalation: Domestic Grievance as a Catalyst for Nuclear Posturing

9. The Feedback Loop of Certainty: Human-AI Interface in Pathological Decision-Making

10. Systemic Vulnerabilities: The Inadequacy of Institutional Guardrails against Pathological Leadership

11. Clinical Mitigation: Integrating Neuro-Psychological Screening into Command and Control

12. Conclusion: Existential Risk and the Necessity of Clinical Oversight in High-Stakes Governance

References

Art

1. The Psychological Architecture of Global Risk

The stability of the international order has long rested on the assumption of the rational actor. In traditional game theory, particularly in nuclear deterrence models such as Mutually Assured Destruction, it is assumed that all participants possess a baseline of self-preservation and a functional capacity for reality testing. However, the psychological architecture of global risk is fundamentally altered when the primary decision-maker of a nuclear power operates outside these parameters. When a leader's cognitive framework is dominated by the traits of malignant narcissism, the standard mechanisms of deterrence—economic sanctions, diplomatic off-ramps, and even the threat of military stalemate—cease to function as intended.

In this context, risk is no longer a matter of state-to-state friction but becomes a byproduct of an individual's internal psychological defenses. The "Sovereign Researcher" model suggests that we must view high-stakes geopolitics not just through the lens of troop movements or throw-weight, but through the neuro-psychological health of the command structure. As of mid-March 2026, the global community faces a unique convergence: a regional war in the Middle East that has reached a tactical impasse, presided over by a leadership style that views any form of de-escalation as a catastrophic narcissistic injury.

This section establishes that the "off-ramp," a staple of rational crisis management, requires a level of cognitive flexibility and impulse control that is often absent in the malignant profile. Furthermore, the integration of high-level AI in military targeting creates a dangerous feedback loop. If the human at the top of the command chain is suffering from diminished inhibitory control due to frontal lobe erosion, the speed and precision of AI-assisted warfare act as an accelerant rather than a safeguard. The architecture of risk is thus a dual-threat system: a technologically advanced military apparatus guided by a psychologically regressing executive. We must therefore redefine existential risk to include the "clinical anomaly" as a primary variable in the equation of nuclear war prevention.

2. Theoretical Framework: Defining Malignant Narcissism as a Clinical Construct

To analyze the current geopolitical crisis, it is necessary to establish a rigorous clinical definition of malignant narcissism. Unlike standard Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD), which is characterized by an inflated sense of self-importance and a need for admiration, malignant narcissism is a "syndromic" construct that integrates several disparate pathological strands. First conceptualized by Erich Fromm and later refined by Otto Kernberg, the disorder is defined by a specific quartet of traits: grandiosity, antisocial behavior, paranoia, and sadism. In a clinical setting, this profile is often described as the bridge between "high-functioning" narcissism and true psychopathy.

The grandiosity component provides the ego-fuel for leadership, but when it becomes malignant, the individual no longer seeks merely to be loved; they seek to be feared and obeyed. The antisocial component manifests as a chronic disregard for laws, norms, and the truth, viewing them as obstacles to be overcome rather than boundaries to be respected. In the context of a 2026 nuclear power, this translates to the erosion of international treaties and institutional protocols. The third element, paranoia, creates a persecutory worldview where all opposition is framed as a coordinated conspiracy. This makes diplomatic negotiation impossible, as the "malignant" leader perceives any offer of compromise as a deceptive trap set by enemies.

Finally, the inclusion of sadism differentiates the malignant profile from the typical narcissist. While a standard narcissist might ignore the pain of others out of indifference, the malignant narcissist uses the infliction of suffering as a tool for ego-reintegration. In high-stakes warfare, this is expressed through a preference for "decimating" or "annihilating" opponents over achieving tactical objectives. By establishing this theoretical framework, we can move beyond layperson descriptions of "volatility" and begin to map the specific clinical pathways through which this disorder blocks the "off-ramps" required for global survival.

3. The Alternative Model for Personality Disorders (AMPD): Mapping Antagonism and Disinhibition

The transition from the traditional categorical model of the DSM-5 to the Section III Alternative Model (AMPD) provides the dimensional precision required to analyze the "no off-ramp" psychological state. Rather than checking a binary box for a single disorder, the AMPD allows researchers to measure specific pathological traits across five broad domains. In the case of a leader manifesting a malignant profile, the most critical domains are Antagonism and Disinhibition. Antagonism is characterized by a persistent belief that one is superior to others, accompanied by an callous lack of empathy and a willingness to exploit or demean others for personal gain. This domain captures the core of the narcissistic injury: any challenge to the leader's perceived superiority is met with extreme hostility, as the individual lacks the internal regulatory mechanisms to process perceived "weakness."

Within the AMPD framework, the traits of Grandiosity and Deceitfulness serve as the primary drivers of the leader’s public narrative. However, it is the trait of Callousness—a component of the Antagonism domain usually associated with antisocial personality—that functions as the blockade to the diplomatic off-ramp. Callousness manifests as an indifference to the human or systemic costs of escalation, including the potential for nuclear exchange. When this is coupled with the domain of Disinhibition, specifically the traits of Impulsivity and Risk Taking, the

psychological profile becomes explosive. Disinhibition represents a failure of the prefrontal cortex to moderate aggressive impulses, leading to "doubling down" on high-risk military maneuvers rather than pursuing calculated retreats.

By mapping these specific traits, we can see that the "malignant" label is not merely a descriptor of personality, but a measurable set of deficits in self and interpersonal functioning. In the AMPD model, the severity of the disorder is tied to the degree of impairment in identity and self-direction. For a leader whose identity is entirely fused with the concept of "unbeatable" power, the prospect of a negotiated peace—which requires acknowledging the legitimacy and agency of an opponent—is a psychological impossibility. The AMPD thus confirms that for the malignant profile, the only "rational" choice is total dominance, regardless of the catastrophic risk to the global collective.

4. Neurobiology of Command: Frontal Lobe Erosion and the Failure of Inhibitory Systems

The psychological constructs of antagonism and disinhibition do not exist in a vacuum; they are rooted in the physical architecture of the brain. In cases where pre-existing malignant personality traits are present, the onset of neurodegeneration, specifically frontal lobe erosion, acts as a catastrophic force multiplier. The prefrontal cortex is the executive center of the brain, responsible for complex decision-making, social behavior, and the inhibition of primitive impulses. It is the biological "brake" that allows an individual to pause, evaluate consequences, and choose a diplomatic path over an aggressive one. When this region begins to atrophy, the ability to regulate the dark quartet of malignant narcissism is compromised, leading to what can be termed the "amplification effect."

Frontal lobe erosion is often characterized by a decline in executive function and an increase in emotional lability. For a leader in a high-stakes geopolitical environment, this neurobiological decline manifests as a loss of the "social filter." Impulses that might have been suppressed or moderated by strategic calculation in younger years are now expressed with raw, unmitigated intensity. In the current 2026 conflict, we observe this in the shift from transactional diplomacy to a singular focus on dominance. The biological failure of the inhibitory systems means that the "off-ramp" is no longer a viable cognitive destination. The brain's circuitry is increasingly locked into a fight-or-flight response, but one fueled by the immense power of a nuclear command structure.

Furthermore, the relationship between frontal lobe health and reality testing is critical. The prefrontal cortex helps the brain distinguish between internal desires and external reality. As this area erodes, the boundary between the leader's ego-driven narrative and the objective facts on the ground—such as actual military losses or the risk of nuclear fallout—becomes

blurred. This neurocognitive breakdown explains the rejection of intelligence reports in favor of personal "hunches" or the labeling of contradictory data as artificial disinformation. Without a functional prefrontal cortex to mediate the narcissistic ego, the leader is biologically incapable of the cognitive flexibility required to avoid a terminal escalation.

5. The No Off-Ramp Phenomenon: Cognitive Biases in Zero-Sum Geopolitical Conflicts

The concept of the "off-ramp" relies on the psychological assumption of cognitive flexibility—the ability to pivot from a failed strategy toward a less damaging alternative. In the context of a zero-sum geopolitical conflict, however, specific cognitive biases inherent to the malignant narcissistic profile render such pivots impossible. Chief among these is the "sunk cost fallacy," amplified by a pathological inability to admit error. For the malignant leader, the investment of military resources and political capital is not viewed as a strategic expenditure but as an extension of the self. To withdraw or compromise is not merely a policy shift; it is a public admission of fallibility that the fragile, grandiose ego cannot survive.

In the March 2026 deadlock, we see the "zero-sum" filter in its most dangerous form. Every interaction is viewed as a win-loss binary, where a gain for the adversary is felt as a physical assault on the leader. This is further complicated by "confirmation bias," where the leader only processes information that supports their narrative of "total victory." Because the malignant profile often surrounds itself with sycophants—or uses AI tools to filter out dissenting data—the feedback loop of certainty becomes absolute. The "off-ramp" disappears because the cognitive pathways required to visualize it have been pruned by a lifetime of antagonistic defense mechanisms.

The psychological blockade is also reinforced by "prospect theory," which suggests that individuals are more likely to take extreme risks to avoid a loss than to achieve a gain. For a leader facing a narcissistic injury, the perceived "loss" of status or power is so catastrophic that nuclear escalation becomes a "rational" gamble within their distorted internal logic. The "no off-ramp" phenomenon is therefore the logical conclusion of a psyche that views reality as a theater for ego-validation. When the script of reality diverges from the script of the ego, the malignant leader prefers to destroy the theater rather than change the performance.

6. Case Study: The March 2026 Middle East Deadlock and the Total Victory Narrative

The current geopolitical climate in March 2026 provides a stark real-world application of the malignant narcissistic profile in a state of high-conflict deadlock. Following the initiation of broad-scale military operations in the Middle East, the tactical situation has evolved into a

stalemate that contradicts the administration's public narrative of swift and total dominance. A critical focal point of this case study is the rhetorical response to the alleged targeting of the USS Abraham Lincoln. While military intelligence and external observers provide data suggesting a complex maritime environment with significant risks, the leadership narrative has pivoted to a binary of "Total Victory" versus "Fake News." This is a classic manifestation of the narcissistic defense against reality: if the facts do not support the image of an invincible leader, the facts themselves must be categorized as malicious fabrications.

The demand for "unconditional surrender" from an adversary that still maintains significant asymmetric capabilities—such as the throttling of the Strait of Hormuz—further illustrates the absence of a strategic off-ramp. In traditional military doctrine, an adversary is given a path to de-escalate that preserves their domestic standing; however, the malignant profile views such nuance as a personal affront. The "Total Victory" narrative is not merely a political slogan in this context; it is a psychological necessity. To accept anything less than the total annihilation of the enemy's will would be to acknowledge a limitation of the leader's own power. This psychological rigidity has created a "deadlock of grandiosity" where the leader is trapped by his own rhetoric, unable to pivot to a diplomatic solution without triggering a profound internal crisis of identity.

Furthermore, the March 2026 Truth Social communications reveal a shift toward domesticating the conflict. By framing the American media as "unpatriotic" and calling for "Treason" charges, the leader attempts to resolve the external military stalemate through internal aggression. This diversionary tactic serves to maintain the "Total Victory" illusion for the core support base while simultaneously punishing those who point out the lack of a clear exit strategy. The case of the USS Abraham Lincoln thus serves as a microcosm for the larger existential risk: when a leader is psychologically incapable of processing a tactical setback, the only available move is to increase the stakes, pushing the conflict closer to the nuclear threshold in an attempt to force reality to yield to the ego.

7. Paranoia and Perceptual Dysregulation: The Invalidation of Reality via AI Disinformation Claims

Paranoia is the cognitive bedrock of the malignant narcissist, serving as a protective mechanism that externalizes all internal failures. In the DSM-5 Section III framework, this often manifests as "Perceptual Dysregulation"—a state where the individual’s internal biases begin to distort the processing of external sensory and factual data. In the context of the March 2026 conflict, this dysregulation has found a potent new scapegoat: Artificial Intelligence. By attributing contradictory evidence—such as the visual documentation of the USS Abraham Lincoln under threat—to "AI-generated fake news," the leader effectively invalidates reality itself. This is not merely a political tactic; it is a clinical defense against narcissistic injury. If the leader’s "Total

Victory" narrative is the only acceptable reality, then any evidence to the contrary must be the product of a sophisticated, technological conspiracy.

This invalidation of reality creates a profound breakdown in the intelligence-to-decision pipeline. When a leader suffers from paranoia-driven perceptual dysregulation, they no longer require evidence to support their claims; rather, the absence of evidence becomes proof of a deeper, more insidious cover-up. The claim that Iran is using AI as a "disinformation weapon" allows the leader to dismiss satellite imagery, eyewitness accounts from naval personnel, and reporting from traditional outlets as "corrupt" fabrications. In this state, the leader's subjective certainty becomes the only trusted source of truth. For a nuclear-armed executive, this means that the "off-ramp" provided by objective situational awareness—knowing when a battle is lost or a risk is too high—is effectively severed.

The danger of this cognitive state is amplified by the "feedback loop of certainty" discussed in previous sections. As the leader increasingly relies on a self-referential information bubble, the paranoia evolves into a closed system. Anyone who attempts to correct the record is labeled as a participant in the AI-driven treason, further isolating the leader from the inhibitory voices of the "adults in the room." Perceptual dysregulation thus transforms a tactical military stalemate into an existential battle against an invisible, technological enemy. This clinical shift makes nuclear escalation more likely, as the leader may feel compelled to use "real" weapons to shatter what they perceive as an "AI-generated" illusion of defeat, thereby forcing the world to acknowledge their version of the truth.

8. Narcissistic Rage and Strategic Escalation: Domestic Grievance as a Catalyst for Nuclear Posturing

Narcissistic rage is a reaction to a perceived threat to a narcissist's self-esteem or self-worth. Unlike normal anger, this rage is characterized by its intensity, its lack of proportion to the slight, and its persistent nature. In a geopolitical context, when a malignant leader’s "Total Victory" narrative is challenged by facts on the ground—such as the failure of Iranian forces to collapse or domestic criticism of military strategy—the resulting rage is not directed toward tactical problem-solving, but toward the "annihilation" of the source of the injury. This creates a dangerous "escalation ladder" where military decisions are driven by the need to soothe the leader’s ego rather than achieve national security objectives.

As of March 2026, we see this rage manifesting as "domesticated aggression." By focusing on the "Late Night Morons" and "Unpatriotic News Organizations," the leader attempts to reassert dominance in a theater where he feels more control: the domestic information space. However, when domestic suppression fails to provide the required ego-validation, the rage is redirected

back toward the international conflict. Nuclear posturing becomes the ultimate tool of narcissistic rage. The threat of a nuclear strike is the ultimate "power move"—a way to force the world to acknowledge the leader's omnipotence and to silence all critics through the threat of global catastrophe.

The "no off-ramp" state is solidified by this rage. Because the leader views the conflict as a personal vendetta, the traditional "rational" inhibitors against nuclear use—such as the fear of retaliation or civilian loss—are overridden by the psychological need to "win" at any cost. Strategic escalation thus becomes a form of "externalized self-destruction." If the leader cannot have the world on his own terms, the malignant profile may conclude that the world itself is not worth preserving. This makes the 2026 deadlock not just a regional war, but a psychological hostage situation where the "off-ramp" is blocked by the leader's own emotional volatility.

9. The Feedback Loop of Certainty: Human-AI Interface in Pathological Decision-Making

The integration of artificial intelligence into military command and control systems was intended to reduce human error and provide objective data for strategic decisions. However, in a leadership structure dominated by malignant narcissism and neurocognitive decline, the human-AI interface creates a "feedback loop of certainty" that eliminates the friction necessary for de-escalation. Instead of serving as a check on impulsive behavior, AI tools can be weaponized to validate the leader's existing biases. By selectively querying models or utilizing "Anomaly Factories" to filter out data that suggests a military stalemate, the leader can maintain a state of "synthetic grandiosity" that is shielded from the complexities of the physical world.

This feedback loop is particularly dangerous when applied to targeting and escalation. In the 2026 Middle East conflict, the use of AI to generate "optimal" strike packages provides a veneer of scientific precision to decisions driven by narcissistic rage. When the AI reports a "99% probability of neutralization," it feeds the leader's delusion of omnipotence, making the rejection of an off-ramp seem like a data-driven choice rather than a psychological failure. Furthermore, the leader's claim that opposing data (such as the burning of the USS Abraham Lincoln) is "AI-generated disinformation" represents a total collapse of the human-AI partnership. In this state, the leader uses the concept of AI as a cognitive shield to delegitimize any reality that causes narcissistic injury.

The result is a closed system where the speed of AI-assisted warfare outpaces the capacity for human reflection. For a leader with frontal lobe erosion, the immediate gratification provided by "successful" AI-driven strikes replaces long-term strategic stability. The "off-ramp" requires time, doubt, and the processing of contradictory information—all of which are purged in a high-

speed, AI-reinforced decision loop. Consequently, the technology designed to prevent accidental war may, in the hands of a pathologically impaired executive, become the very mechanism that automates the path to nuclear escalation.

10. Systemic Vulnerabilities: The Inadequacy of Institutional Guardrails against Pathological Leadership

The global security architecture is built upon the assumption that institutional guardrails—constitutional checks, cabinet oversight, and military chains of command—can restrain the erratic impulses of a single individual. However, the malignant narcissistic profile is specifically designed to bypass, co-opt, or dismantle these very structures. In a system where the leader views institutional norms as personal insults or "deep state" conspiracies, the guardrails do not serve as brakes; they are perceived as targets for destruction. As of 2026, the reliance on "the adults in the room" has proven to be a systemic vulnerability rather than a fail-safe.

One primary failure of these guardrails is the psychological phenomenon of "enabling." Subordinates, often selected for their loyalty (or "Antagonism" traits that mirror the leader's), become part of a collective narcissistic system. In this environment, presenting a diplomatic off-ramp is viewed as an act of disloyalty or "treason." The military chain of command, while theoretically bound by law, faces an unprecedented crisis when the Commander-in-Chief interprets legal constraints as partisan sabotage. When the leader calls for the "charges for TREASON" against media outlets or challenges the licenses of broadcasters via the FCC, he is testing the structural integrity of the state’s defensive systems.

Furthermore, the nuclear command and control system is historically designed for speed and "positive control," not for psychological vetting. There is no formal mechanism within the current launch protocol to "veto" a strike based on the clinical diagnosis of the executive’s mental state. If the leader’s frontal lobe erosion results in an impulsive, rage-driven order, the system is biased toward execution rather than reflection. The March 2026 deadlock has exposed a terrifying reality: the world’s most sophisticated legal and military institutions are largely defenseless against a leader who has lost the biological and psychological capacity for rational self-restraint.

11. Clinical Mitigation: Integrating Neuro-Psychological Screening into Command and Control

The existential risks identified in the 2026 Middle East deadlock suggest that traditional political and legal checks are insufficient when faced with a leader suffering from the convergence of malignant personality traits and neurocognitive decline. A necessary evolution in global security

is the integration of formal neuro-psychological screening into the command-and-control hierarchy. Currently, individuals with access to high-level security clearances undergo rigorous psychological evaluation; however, the executive branch is often exempt from such scrutiny under the guise of democratic mandate. This creates a "rationality gap" at the highest level of nuclear decision-making.

Clinical mitigation requires a shift from subjective political assessment to objective medical measurement. Utilizing advanced imaging and cognitive testing to monitor the health of the prefrontal cortex—the biological seat of the "off-ramp"—should be a standardized requirement for any individual with the authority to initiate a nuclear exchange. Specifically, screening for biomarkers of frontal lobe erosion and dimensional trait scores in the Antagonism and Disinhibition domains of the DSM-5 Section III would provide a data-driven baseline. This is not about political removal but about ensuring that the person at the top of the command chain possesses the basic biological hardware required for impulse control and reality testing.

Furthermore, AI-assisted diagnostic tools can play a role in real-time monitoring. By analyzing linguistic patterns, such as the increased frequency of "splitting" (all-good vs. all-bad), paranoia-driven syntax, and the loss of complex grammatical structures, clinicians can identify the onset of a "Feedback Loop of Certainty." If a leader’s communication exhibits a significant spike in pathological traits alongside a degradation in cognitive nuance, a "Consultative Hold" could be triggered within the command chain. Such a system would formalize the role of medical science in preventing nuclear escalation, ensuring that the "off-ramp" is maintained not just as a diplomatic theory, but as a functional neurological capability.

12. Conclusion: Existential Risk and the Necessity of Clinical Oversight in High-Stakes Governance

The current geopolitical crisis of March 2026 serves as a definitive proof of concept for the "no off-ramp" theory of malignant leadership. When a decision-maker is insulated from reality by the dark quartet of malignant narcissism—grandiosity, antisociality, paranoia, and sadism—and further compromised by the biological erosion of inhibitory control, the mechanisms of rational deterrence fail. We have demonstrated that the "off-ramp" is not merely a diplomatic convenience but a psychological and neurological requirement for crisis management. Without the prefrontal capacity to tolerate narcissistic injury or the cognitive flexibility to acknowledge an opponent's agency, the leader is biologically predisposed to choose terminal escalation over face-saving compromise.

The convergence of AI-driven warfare and pathological psychology represents the ultimate systemic risk. The speed of modern conflict leaves no room for the delays that historically

allowed "the adults in the room" to temper the impulses of a volatile executive. Furthermore, when the leader weaponizes the concept of "disinformation" to shield the ego from military setbacks, the shared reality required for international stability dissolves. This paper concludes that the preservation of global security in the 21st century requires the integration of clinical psychology and neuropsychology into the very fabric of governance.

The "Sovereign Researcher" model suggests that we can no longer afford to treat leadership health as a private matter. As we stand at the threshold of potential nuclear exchange in the Middle East, the necessity for clinical oversight has moved from the theoretical to the existential. To prevent the final collapse of the "off-ramp," institutional guardrails must be updated to include objective, data-driven assessments of cognitive and psychological fitness. Only by acknowledging the clinical reality of malignant narcissism and its neurobiological reinforcements can we hope to design a global command structure capable of surviving the "clinical anomaly" of a pathologically impaired leader.

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed.). Section III: Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders.
2. Kernberg, O. F. (1984). Severe Personality Disorders: Psychotherapeutic Strategies. Yale University Press.
3. Fromm, E. (1964). The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil. Harper & Row.
4. Youvan, D. C. (2026). Amplification of Narcissistic Personality Disorder by Dementia. Preprints on ResearchGate.
5. Post, J. M. (2015). Narcissism and Philanthropy: Ideas and Talent in the Service of the Self. Political Psychology.
6. Sapolsky, R. M. (2017). Behave: The Biology of Humans at Our Best and Worst. Penguin Press.
7. Truth Social. (2026, March 15). Post by @realDonaldTrump regarding Iran, AI Disinformation, and the USS Abraham Lincoln.
8. Wall Street Journal. (2026, March). Reporting on Persian Gulf Maritime Conflict and Operation Epic Fury.
9. World Health Organization. (2022). ICD-11 for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics: Personality Disorders and Related Traits.
10. Gottfried, J. S., & Zald, D. H. (2024). Neurobiology of Executive Dysfunction in Aging Leaders. Journal of Neuropsychiatry.

The author has published over 5,000 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

SITUATION ROOM
2026 MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT ZONE
TURKEY
TURKMENISTAN
SYRIA
LEBANON
ISRAEL
IRAQ
IRAN
EGYPT
NUCLEAR RISK
NO OFF-RAMP
THROTTLED
STRAIT OF HORMUZ
PATHOLOGICAL PATHWAYS TO GLOBAL CATASTROPHE
FRONTAL LOBE EROSION /
NEURODEGENERATION
MALIGNANT NARCISSISM
DSM-5
SECTION III
DARK QUARTET:
GRANDIOSITY
ANTISOCIALITY
PARANOIA
SADISM